105 421 tresses had so many more people to work for them that they became wealthier and wealthier.

592 556 In addition to this, chiefs were able, as major parties in trading, to control large amounts of property. The rich were respected and were called *Nishipa* [the rich] while those who possessed nothing and worked for others were called *Wenkuru* [abominable persons] and were despised.[72] Those who could extend their benevolence to many succeeded in Ainu society while those unable to repay sufficiently had the lowest position. The rich eventually became the village masters or *Kotan Isapane*. This is seen in a story from *Ainu Shinyōshū* called "The song sung by the God of owls himself, around the silver drops."[73] This new leader took the place of the old blood chief by virtue of his wealth and economic power although he was obliged to have proper blood relationships.[74] Since the chief had to stand treat to the village once a year wealth was a necessary requirement for chiefdom. The *HDHS* . . . says: "Once or twice a year, the chief or the man with both wealth and virtue would treat men and women, old and young from neighboring countries with millet wine. . . . This was called *Kamoi Nomi*" [drinking to the gods].

105 554 565 [557] 105 622 [273]

178 622 Regulations came more and more to be based on actualities than on custom. Nevertheless, the communal economy among kinsfolk was not entirely gone and the chief had no power of control over each individual except for his *Utare*. He was regarded only as the head of a family which had more *Utare* than anyone else in the village. Vol. 3 of *Ezo Zakki Yakusetsu*, written in 1622, says, "The chief had only three or four servants to serve him." The heads of other families in the village were entitled to settle their own family affairs without recourse to the judgment of the village chief and the approval of the chief was called for only when a situation involved the entire village or kinfolk. Issues confronting the entire village were settled by a general village conference where the chief was only one of the speakers. However, it was but natural that the more powerful and wealthy of the chiefs, especially those with a large number of relations should extend their power over several villages and the pressure from the Japanese drove the Ainu villages into a conscious union from which there arose chiefs of tremendous power among their people. Yet the Ainu never formed a nation because their economy never developed to the point where it could support a permanent political organization and when they did acquire, from the Japanese, the necessary advanced economic techniques, the Japanese were, at the same time, acquiring political control over the Ainu and the subsequent Ainu attempt to form a small primitive nation came to nothing. For example, look at the region along the Ishikari River

[627] [623] 105 64 000

[72] *Yūkara Kenkyū* 2: 289, note.
[73] *Ainu Shinyōshū*, 1 ff.
[74] Matsumoto Nobuhiro, Aino Potorachi, *Minzoku Gaku* 2: 4.

[P.23(A)]

2: Batchelor M-5 (1877-1924) 1927
AB6 Ainu AB6

627 692 The punishment of minor offences and recognized crime was left pretty much to the injured individual and community.

622 627 It was the duty of the principal chief to lead the people in hunting, fishing, and fighting, in conjunction with the sub-chiefs, and to take a prominent part in the national bear festival. He had to attend to the division of the land among his people, to point out to each woman her garden plot, to visit the sick, settle disputes, pronounce sentence on the guilty, and name children. All trials took place in public, and unless [623] the assembled elders of the people assented to the decision of the chief, his judgment was void. This was sometimes practised in secret by the people when I first went among them. That they had recognized advocates to assist in disputes will be seen further on.

622 562 593 [184] In so far as the Hokkaidō Ainu were concerned, in very remote times, and in very small villages, the chief authority was naturally vested in the head of the family, though in Saghalien the mother had a great deal to say in the matter, even taking a higher place than her husband. The husband and father, in Hokkaidō, could do pretty much as he pleased with his wives and children. He could, for example, divorce [586 428] any or all of his wives or disinherit his children. He could punish any member of his family as he thought proper. But, notwithstanding this, it was thought to be better form for him to consult his chiefs and companions in these matters.

621 How this came to be so was explained to me in this way. Suppose any single individual or family should move away from all friends and build a house in the wilds at some distance from any village, as was sometimes the case in Hokkaidō, this would become the nucleus of a new village. Such a settlement would naturally come under the rule of the father, who, as new huts were built near him for the accommodation of his sons as they got married, remained head of the

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

during which the Ainu, especially those in the interior regions, still led their social life of independence based on gathering activities, with a minimum of intercourse with Japanese through trading and fishing labour. In Tokapchi, for instance, which forms a main subject area for the present study and where Japanese immigration and settlement came later than in other districts, practically no Japanese immigrants were found in ca. 1874 (Hokkaido-chō, ed., 1937, Vol. 3, p. 299). It was in 1882-1883 when a small party of Japanese settlers called "Banseisha" came to settle near Obihiro on the middle Tokapchi to open up the interior part of the river valley (Note 10). In the upper Tokapchi surveyed by the author not a single Japanese settler was found even at the outset of the land allotment and the agricultural coaching programme launched in that area in 1886 (Notes 8-10). As a result the Tokapchi Ainu remained free in their gathering activities and from Japanese pressure and influence till a comparatively later period. Hunting of deer in the entire Tokapchi area was banned in 1879 to all except the local Ainu (TAKAKURA, 1942, p. 437); salmon fishing in the upper Tokapchi, which had been prohibited in 1883, was released later to local natives alone (TAKAKURA, 1942, p. 486).

According to the author's informants relating their own experiences, the contemporary social intercourse between the interior Tokapchi Ainu and Japanese was as follows. Conditions in the Azuma valley seems to have been much the same. Every year when it was spring, Japanese agents came by boat to the interior Ainu settlements in order to hire natives for employment at coastal fishing grounds. The selection of the persons to go was decided at the *ukosanio*, assembly of the headman and house-heads of the local group. Such negotiations with Japanese were generally conducted by a representative called "ottena", an old title conferred by the feudal clan on native officers under the "basho" system and still used among the Ainu after its abolition by the Japanese Government. Sometimes the title "ottena" was held concurrently by the traditional headman himself, as at Nitmap and Pipaushi in Tokapchi (Note 23, N12 and P6); sometimes it was held by some one else, as at Moseushi (Note 23, M3 and M14). Ainus hired for labour at the fishing coasts were mostly young men but included some women. Work for women, such as drying of sea-tangles, was sometimes over in a relatively short period; but work for men, chiefly salmon and sardine fishing, usually lasted well into autumn. On return home these men had immediately to go hunting at their huts with fellow members (for examples see Note 41, Shiokoro's and Shurunke's families). In reward for their service at the fishing coasts they received wine and foodstuffs, such as rice and salt. In spring Japanese fur traders also came to their settlements to exchange deer and bear skins, bark clothes and other products for articles of clothing, such as cotton fabrics, articles of taste and food, such as wine, tabacco, rice and salt. The

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

The *ekashi ikiru*, instead of standing for a lineage in the strict sense of the word, tends to serve as a means of consolidating the *kotan* as a territorial group" ibid.). While stating, however, that "the male members of the *kotan* constituted one or more patrilineal kinship groups, called *ekashi ikiru*," SUGIURA makes no reference as to how an outsider might gain a membership of "a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru* groups" (ibid.). For this point we must turn to IZUMI, who worked with SUGIURA on the same survey. Resting wholly on the first set of data without touching on the second which was regarded by SUGIURA as deviation from the norm, IZUMI gives the following remarks. "Usually, members of a *kotan* consist of families of one and the same family line (*ekasni ikiru*), and rarely of more than one.... Every stranger entering the *kotan* must be reported to the chief, *kotan koru kuru*.... The chief (after much deliberation) calls a village assembly, *ukoramkoru*, to ask for general consent.... If married, the newcomers receive permission to put up a temporary shed on the *kotan keshi*, lower outskirt of the village. If unmarried, the person is taken in charge of some willing household. These people are called *tomta ek kur* (newcomer) or *iyor un kur* (hanger-on). They are not the members of the village so that they have difficulty in getting a living within the *iworu* (rendered 'arena of life' by IZUMI; p. 70 and Note 58 of the *kotan*. As a result, a bachelor will have to offer himself as servant to the household where he is staying, doing such work as is appointed by the master. A married couple have to sustain their lives by labouring in the service of the *kotan koru kuru* and some other person. At the end of a year or two the chief calls another assembly, at which, if there is no objecton, a ritual called *tomta onkami* is arranged to take the newcomer formerly into *kotan* membership. If, however, there are many objections, the person is driven out of the community.... If the newcomer is too young to know his *itokpa* family mark) and *pase onkami* (*kamuiromi* ritual for some important *kamui*, or if he is marrying a girl of the *kotan* as son-in-law (*inau ramat*, heir), the person goes off his old *ekashi ikiru* and obtains new *itokpa* and *pase onkami* to become a member of the *ekashi ikiru*. This procedure is what is called *itokpa kikiraye*. If the village is composed of more than one *ekashi ikiru*, he goes into one or the other of the groups. An adopted son naturally goes into that group to which his adoptive family belongs. In all other cases it is usual for the newcomer, by means of *itokpa kikiraye*, to go into that of the household where he is staying as *iyor un kuru*. For married *tomta* who are familiar with their *ekashi ikiru*, its *itokpa* and *pase onkami*, the *itokpa kikiraye* is not so simple a procedure. If a *tomta* is thoughtful and is desirous of entering any one of the *ekashi ikiru* groups in the *kotan*, he must either entrust or contribute the best part of his treasures to the *kotan koru kuru* (if there is only one *ekashi ikiru* in the village) or to that *utaru pake*, head of

an *ekashi ikiru*, who has approved of his *itokpa kikiyare* (if there are more than one)" (IZUMI, 1951, pp. 34-35). So far as the Tokapchi and Otopuke valleys before the land allotment are concerned, there is no evidence of a village assembly to assume such political functions in the days when the headmen swayed in the traditional way. Again, in these two valleys at least, *itokpa kikiraye* did not represent a transmission of an *itokpa* with associated ritual for affiliation into a local group. Instead, it is said to have meant an exchange of *ekashi itokpa* between two persons out of peculiar interest in the history of each other's *itokpa*, though detailed circumstances for such an action are not known. When such occurred, though very rarely with justification, it is said that the procedure required full sanction and directions from the headmen concerned.

Now the first question that arises will be about the relation between *utaru pake* (head of *ekashi ikiru*) and *kotan koru kuru* (head of local group). Concerning this point IZUMI remarks: "The *kotan koru kuru* is head of the *kotan* as territorial group; in case of a *kotan* of *shine* (one) *ekashi ikiru* he is at the same time *utaru pake*, head of the kin group that forms the *kotan*. Within a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru*, so views one informant, Hachiro Kurokawa of Nuki-pet, each *ekashi ikiru* had an *utar pake* of its own, that of the most influential acting as *kotan koru kuru* as well. In contradiction to the view another informant, Kunimatsu Nitani of Niputani, informs: 'The word *utaru pake* means, not "Zoku-chō" (*head of ekashi ikiru*), but a "big man" or "old man". If you look for a word meaning "Zoku-chō" the word "*utaru koru kuru*" (person who owns people) would be more appropriate. *Utaru koru kuru* in this sense would then be synonymous with *kotan koru kuru*. However, even in a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru* the presence of an *utaru koru kuru* apart from the *kotan koru kuru* has never been heard of.' More extensive investigation seems necessary before anything can be said with certainty about which of these views is correct or if either view holds good of some particular localities...." (ibid. p. 35).

Regarding this conflict of information SUGIURA makes the following remarks. "However, when more than one *ekasni ikiru* groups formed a *kotan*, did only one head and no one else represent the *kotan*?.... No evidence has been available to prove the theory that the *ekashi ikiru* formed a territorial group on the basis of the *kotan*, its chief (*utaru pake*) directing and controlling the male members sharing *shine* (one) *itokpa*. On the other hand it seems that there is not sufficient ground to deny the presence of the *utaru pake*. As far as is known today, the social life in the *kotan*, conducted chiefly on family basis, shows no sign of a strong solidarity worthy of an *ekashi ikiru*. The *pase onkami* mentioned above and the ancestor-ritual to be mentioned later are both apparently on a family level and not events for collec-

1, [Errata: the word "meang" should read "meaning". Cf. errata sheet, p. 164-A--Analyst]